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Reviewer's report:

This is an excellent paper, much needed, in a highly topical and controversial area of influenza vaccinology. The systematic review and meta-analysis has been well executed and described, save for a complete absence of any risk of bias assessment. Without this, the reader cannot judge if the findings and conclusions are based on the pooling of data from high, medium, or low quality studies. This work needs to be undertaken and then added to the Methods (tools used), the Results (findings of risk of bias assessment) and the implications of the findings given the data quality (in the Discussion). I suggest some other minor changes to the Introduction and Discussion (attached). Apart from this, it is a great paper. The questions and subsequent analyses are carefully formulated and presented to be relevant to both patients and policy makers. The important limitations are discussed. This paper is likely to be highly cited.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.
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Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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